

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION**

<b>BRANDON JAMAAL RAMBO,</b>	)	
<b>ID # 56974-177,</b>	)	
<b>Movant,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>vs.</b>	)	<b>No. 3:21-CV-1532-D</b>
	)	<b>No. 3:18-CR-186-D(3)</b>
	)	
<b>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,</b>	)	
<b>Respondent.</b>	)	

**ORDER**


After reviewing all relevant matters of record in this case, including the findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the court is of the opinion that the findings and conclusions of the magistrate judge are correct, and they are adopted as the findings and conclusions of the court. For the reasons stated in the findings, conclusions, and recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge, the Amended Motion Under 28 USC § 2255, received on August 30, 2021 (ECF No. 7), is denied with prejudice.

In accordance with Fed. R. App. P. 22(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c) and after considering the record in this case and the recommendation of the magistrate judge, the movant is denied a Certificate of Appealability. The court adopts and incorporates by reference the magistrate judge's findings, conclusions, and recommendation in support of its finding that the movant has failed to show (1) that reasonable jurists would find this court's "assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong," or (2) that reasonable jurists would find "it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right" and "debatable whether [this Court] was correct in its procedural ruling." *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).

In the event that the movant files a notice of appeal, he must pay the \$605.00 appellate filing fee or submit a motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* that is accompanied by a properly signed certificate of inmate trust account.

**SO ORDERED.**

January 22, 2024.

  
SIDNEY A. FITZWATER  
SENIOR JUDGE